



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922.330	08/03/2001	Katsumi Kato	9281-4143	7391

7590

04/15/2003

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

HESS, DANIEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,330

Applicant(s)

KATO ET AL

Examiner

Daniel A Hess

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Priority is acknowledged based on Japan 2000-243784, filed 8/11/2000, a certified copy of which has been received and placed in the file of record.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 19-23, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurita et al. (US 5,353,016) (not to be confused with another Kurita reference mentioned in this document).

Kurita teaches a remote controller with a changeable operating card having all of the elements and means as recited in claims 1, 19-23, 25 and 27 drawn to an apparatus. For example, Kurita teaches the following:

Re claims 1 and 20: See especially figure 1 of Kurita. There is a remote controller (column 1, lines 5-10), wireless (infrared) transmission, and input by depressing at some position to control a TV or VCR (column 2, lines 63-68). There is a display portion that includes (figure 1) a card 18 that is interchangeable. The functionality of the remote can be altered by "*merely replacing the said operating cards... as needed*" (column 1, lines 64-65). Further, the control

Art Unit: 2876

functionality depends both on the coordinates and the card that is identified (column 1, lines 50-57).

Re claim 19: A "touch panel" (column 2, line 51) can be considered an x-y contact pad.

Re claims 21-24: As Kurita makes clear (column 6, lines 45-53; figure 9) identifying notches may be employed on the side of the card to indicate the type of card. The principle of equivalence (In Re Dillon, MPEP 2144) applies, where these shape permutations can be considered equivalent in the art. Further, this difference may be considered a simple shape variation. Using projections instead of grooves on the edge of the card, or a combination of both, and / or using numbers and / or positions of each are just shape variations on the idea expressed by Kurita et al.

Re claim 25: There is a case (figure 1), the case having a slot 14a (column 2, lines 52-56) for receiving the card.

Re claim 27: The cards are shown to have in one embodiment (column 3, lines 1-10) a circuit completion structure.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2876

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-4 and 6-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurita as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Madill et al. (US Des. 363932). The teachings of Kurita as applied to claim 1 have been discussed above.

Re claim 2: Kurita fails to teach that the changeable card is above the sensor input. Rather, in Kurita (column 1, lines 40-65) it is clear that although coordinates are taken, the display card is underneath the touch screen 10.

The difference between having an overlaid card and a card which goes underneath the sensor panel does not produce any functional difference.

Madill shows (entire document) a multi-functional remote with an interchangeable overlaid card.

In view of Madill, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the old and well-known overlaid interchangeable card of Madill instead of the underlying card of Kurita because the clear, touch-sensitive screen in Kurita is potentially more expensive and fragile than pressure-sensitive buttons of Madill.

Re claim 3: See Kurita, column 1, lines 40-65; entire document.

Re claims 4 and 11: As Kurita makes clear (column 6, lines 45-53; figure 9) identifying notches may be employed on the side of the card to indicate the type of card.

Re claim 6: A plurality of display cards is clearly indicated (see column 1, lines 40-65; throughout document).

Re claims 7 and 8: These claims represent simple shape permutations of the notches on the side of the card as discussed re claim 4 above (see column 6, lines 45-53; figure 9). The principle of equivalence (In Re Dillon, MPEP 2144) applies, where these shape permutations can be considered equivalent in the art. Further, this difference may be considered a simple shape variation. Using projections instead of grooves on the edge of the card, or a combination of both, and / or using numbers and / or positions of each are just shape variations on the idea expressed by Kurita et al.

Re claims 9 and 14: There is a case (figure 1), the case having a slot 14a (column 2, lines 52-56) for receiving the card.

Re claim 10: Kurita may or may not show employing opposite sides of a single card (column 6, lines 38-45); his discussion on the topic is brief.

In any event, printing on both sides of a sheet of paper instead of using two single-sided printings is old and well-known in the art. In view of this printing practice, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known double-sided printing idea in the function cards of Kurita because this can reduce the number of function cards for simplicity, and to reduce the risk of losing a card.

Re claim 11: See arguments re claim 4 above.

Re claim 12: The cards are shown to have in one embodiment (column 3, lines 1-10) a circuit completion structure.

Re claim 13: See discussion / arguments re claims 1-3 and 10 above.

Re claim 15: The use of optical means to read the cutout portion is not explicitly stated in Kurita.

It is however, old and well known from audiocassette tapes and floppy disks to employ a light beam to read cutout tabs indicating re-recordability. In view of this, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known optical means to read cutout portions because this is generally less prone to breakdown than mechanical means, which employ moving parts.

Re claim 16: Notches to indicate a card type are an example of indicia. A barcode is another type of indicia, and as long as the card type is conveyed, the device will work as required. Therefore, the principle of equivalence applies (In Re Dillon, MPEP 2144).

Re claim 17: The notches of figure 9 may be pressing against mechanical switches. Whether the notches interact with an optical means or with mechanical switches is not clear; nevertheless, both means to the end are equivalent in the art (In Re Dillon).

5. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurita as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Funado (US 5,537,107). The teachings of Kurita as applied to claim 1 have been discussed above.

Kurita fails to show that the TV or VCR conveys information that then affects the display on the remote.

Funado teaches (abstract) a video signal that is transmitted from a TV to a remote for display on an LCD screen.

In view of Funado's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known signal conveyed from a TV to a remote as taught by Funado into the teachings of Kurita because this enables a user to browse channels first on the remote before changing the picture on the TV, causing less annoyance to fellow viewers.

### *Conclusion*

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. A number of remote controls and calculators are known in the prior art which have interchangeable input sections, based on swappable cards. Examples are: Dunaway (US 5,450,079), Darbee (US 5,422,783), Komaki (US 4,890,832), Bagley (US 4,078,257), and Kurita (US 5,235,328).



Art Unit: 2876


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel A Hess whose telephone number is (703) 305-3841. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM M-F.
8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.
9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



DH

April 4, 2003

Daniel A Hess  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2876



KARL D. FRECH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER